

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHAD DANIEL CAMOU,

Defendant.

Case No. 11CR5027-H


INDICATIVE ORDER REGARDING
SUPPRESSION OF EVIDENCE
UNDER RULE 60(b)

On June 25, 2014, the Supreme Court of the United States issued its decision in Riley v. California, No. 13-132 (U.S. June 25, 2014), holding that “police generally may not, without a warrant, search digital information on a cell phone seized from an individual who has been arrested.”

Given the Supreme Court’s ruling on this issue, the court would, under Rule 60(b), suppress the evidence in this case if the court had jurisdiction. Based on the court’s understanding of Riley v. California, the government would not be able to proceed in this case. Accordingly, the government is directed to notify the court of any intent to dismiss this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: June 26, 2014


HONORABLE MARILYN L. HUFF
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE